



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/775,732	02/09/2004	Bhasker Allam	010327-007210US	1552
20350 7590 04/14/2008 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			EXAMINER ZHANG, SHIRLEY X	
			ART UNIT 2144	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/14/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/775,732

Applicant(s)

ALLAM ET AL.

Examiner

SHIRLEY X. ZHANG

Art Unit

2144

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-13, 15 and 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-13, 15 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This final office action is prepared in response to the amendments and arguments the applicant filed on January 22, 2008 as a reply to the non-final office action mailed on October 22, 2007.

Claims 3 and 14 have been cancelled;

Claims 1, 4 and 13 have been amended;

Claims 1-2, 4-13, and 15-16 are now pending;

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments and amendments filed on January 22, 2008 have been carefully considered but are deemed unpersuasive.

Applicant's arguments are deemed unpersuasive in view of the following new grounds of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by Applicant's substantial amendments to the claims which significantly affected the scope of claims 1 and 13 and their dependent claims.

Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

1. **The objection to the abstract and specification of the original application is withdrawn** in view of the applicant's amendments.
2. **The amended claim 1** is now also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. **The rejection of claims 7 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is maintained.** Applicant's arguments regarding claims 1, 7 and 13 have been carefully considered but are found unpersuasive.

Regarding claim 7, applicant made two remarks to which the examiner responds herein below.

1) Applicant states that the external processes described in Huang are external to the ENTRAPID environment and require a proxy to interact with the kernel, whereas the "application" recited in claim 7 is part of the routing device and can interact directly with the kernel, unlike the external processes described in Huang.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's remark for the following reasons.

First of all, although Huang's external process is external to the ENTRAPID environment, it still runs on the same hardware platform and the same kernel, as shown in Figure 1, therefore it is part of the routing device, similar to the "application" recited in claim 7.

Secondly, the proxy interface disclosed in Huang merely provides an interface to the kernel, which facilitates the direct interaction between the application and the kernel. As to the claimed invention, it is unclear to the examiner how the application recited in claim 7 can interact with the kernel without going through some layers of software interfaces or function calls.

Examiner would also like to remind the applicant that during patent examination, the pending claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification, see MPEP 2111.

2) Applicant states that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine the IP Infusion and Huang references as suggested in the Office Action.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's remark because the IP Infusion reference states very specifically in the section "Defining Virtual Routing" on page 2 that "a virtual router is an emulation of a physical router at the software layer" and "Essentially many instances of router an protocol code may be running on a single unit," which disclosure implies that the many instances of router must share the same operating system kernel when running on a single unit. IP Infusion, section "Virtual routing Requirements" on page 2 further discloses that a VR must contain its own instance of the applicable routing protocols and be fully independent from another VR. Such requirements imposed by IP Infusion on its VR are met by the ENTRAPID model proposed by Huang. Therefore, one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine them at the time the present invention was made.

Rejections of 13 are maintained for the same rationale as applied to claim 7 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. **Claims 1-2, and 4-6** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 recites a routing device which, lacking storage on a computer-readable medium that enables any underlying functionality to occur, appears to direct to a computer software per se. Neither does the claim appear to include a judicial exception.

Claims 2 and 4-6 are dependent on claim 1, but failed to further limit the claims to statutory subject matter. Therefore, claims 2 and 4-6 inherit the 35 U.S.C. 101 issue of the independent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. **Claims 1-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by IP Infusion ("Virtual Routing for Provider Edge Applications", a white paper by **IP Infusion**, Inc.), in view of Huang et al. ("The ENTRAPID Protocol Development Environment", hereinafter "**Huang**").

Regarding claim 1, IP Infusion teaches a routing device (Fig. 4 discloses a virtual router system) comprising:

An operating system kernel (IP Infusion, page 4, section "Virtual Router Design Considerations" discloses VxWorks as a possible choice of a real-time operating system);

a plurality of virtual routers (Fig. 4 discloses a plurality of virtual routers VR1, VR 2 and VRn that are situated inside the virtual router system);

wherein virtual router further includes:

a routing protocol stack configured to handle a plurality of routing protocols (Fig. 3 discloses a virtual router supporting a plurality of routing protocols including RIP, OSPF and BGP);

a plurality of interface drivers configured to communicate with a plurality of corresponding physical interfaces (Page 6, column 2, paragraph 2 discloses that multiple interfaces can be assigned to a single VR, where it is well known in the art that every physical interface inherently corresponds to an interface driver);

an Internet Protocol (IP) stack configured to interact with the routing protocol stack and perform a forwarding function via the plurality of interface drivers (Fig. 3 discloses that the virtual router contains a TCP/IP stack that interacts with routing protocols such as RIP, OSPF and BGP on one side, and connects to a forwarding plane to perform forwarding function via the physical interfaces on the other side, as is described in page 4, column 1, paragraph 2; The forwarding plane inherently forwards packets to the physical interfaces via interface drivers.), the IP stack having a forwarding information table, information from which is used to perform the forwarding function (page 6, column 1, paragraph 3 discloses that the TCP/IP stack includes many features of a VR, such as software forwarding and management of the FIBs).

a router manager configured to manage the plurality of virtual routers (Fig. 4 discloses a Global Management Authority (GMA) that creates and manages virtual routers); and

an application, wherein the application is situated external to the plurality of virtual routers (The Global Management Authority (GMA) disclosed in Fig. 4 is a software package that performs not only router manager functions, but also other system administrative functions such as remote login, therefore it is interpreted to anticipate said application recited in the claim.),

wherein the application is able to selectively communicate with one or more of the plurality of virtual routers on a dynamic basis to have the one or more virtual routers perform a plurality of tasks (Page 3, column 1 discloses that GMA is created so that global

administrators can login to the router system in runtime and then selectively login to a chosen VR to execute commands).

IP Infusion does not teach but Huang teaches a socket layer having a corresponding socket application programming interface, the socket layer configured to facilitate interactions between the IP stack and the routing protocol stack and the application, wherein the socket application programming interface is used to facilitate communications with the socket layer (Huang, page 4, column 1, paragraph 1 discloses that applications built using the BSD socket API can be ported immediately to a virtualized network kernel (VNK) which is a user-space IP protocol stack. Huang's disclosure implies that VNK supports a BSD socket API.)

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Huang's teaching of socket API to IP Infusion's virtual router system such that a socket layer is included to facilitate interactions between the IP stack, the routing protocol stack and the application, as is recited in the claim.

One would have been motivated to combine as such for the reason that sockets have been widely used in network programming as an inter-process communication mechanism since its introduction in the 1980s.

Furthermore, the IP fusion reference states very specifically in the section "Defining Virtual Routing" on page 2 that "a virtual router is an emulation of a physical router at the software layer" and "Essentially many instances of router an protocol code may be running on a single unit," which disclosure implies that the many instances of router must share the same operating system kernel when running on a single unit. IP Infusion, section "Virtual routing Requirements" on page 2 further discloses that a VR must contain its own instance of the

applicable routing protocols and be fully independent from another VR. Such requirements imposed by IP fusion on its VR is met by the ENTRAPID model proposed by Huang. Therefore, one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine them at the time the present invention was made.

Regarding claim 2, the combination of IP Infusion and Huang teaches the routing device of claim 1 wherein software is used to implement the plurality of virtual routers and the router manager (Page 5, column 2, paragraph 2 discloses that a virtual router comprises a full implementation of a physical router at the software level).

Regarding claim 4, the combination of IP Infusion and Huang teaches the routing device of claim 3.

IP Infusion does not explicitly disclose that the IP stack of each of the plurality of virtual routers resides external to the operating system kernel.

However, Huang discloses a virtualized networking system that comprises an operating system kernel and a plurality of virtualized networking kernels (VNK) and processes residing external to the OS kernel (see page 3, column 2). A VNK is the result of extracting the networking portion of the FreeBSD protocol from the kernel and moving it into the user space, i.e. a VNK is an instance of the user-space IP stack (see page 5, column 1, paragraph 2). Huang further discloses that one or more virtualized processes can run on top of a VNK to implement networking protocols such routing protocols above the IP layer, as the purpose of ENTRAPID is to provide a protocol development environment (see page 4, column 1, paragraph 1 and page 8,

column 1, section VII). Thus, a VNK and its corresponding virtualized processes together form a virtual router.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify IP Infusion's virtual router system with Huang's teaching such that the routing device further comprises an operating system kernel wherein the IP stack of each of the plurality of virtual routers resides external to the operating system kernel. One would have been motivated to combine as such for the desirable advantages that (1) the resulted system allows each copy of the IP stack to work independently; (2) existing user-space applications can be ported immediately to the virtual router (Huang, page 4, column 1), and (3) developers can monitor and modify any aspect of the entire protocol stack without having to make any changes to the kernel (Huang, page 3, column 2, last paragraph).

Regarding claim 5, the combination of IP Infusion and Huang teaches the routing device of claim 4.

IP Infusion does not teach but Huang further teaches that the operating system kernel includes an associated socket layer, the socket layer having a corresponding socket application programming interface, and the application is able to communicate with the operating system kernel via the associated socket layer using the corresponding socket application programming interface to have the operating system kernel perform one or more of the plurality of tasks (Huang, page 5, column 2, paragraph 1 discloses that ENTRAPID's virtualization approach has been tested on FreeBSD and can be further applied to Windows NT and Solaris. It is known in the art of networking that in FreeBSD, Solaris and Windows, the TCP/IP stack is implemented in

the kernel, and is accessible to user space applications via a socket API, i.e., applications external to the operating system kernel communicate with the kernel via a socket layer and socket API).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify IP Infusion's virtual router system with Huang's teaching so that the operating system kernel of the virtual router system includes an associated socket layer. The fact that socket API has been used as a standard way of communication between networking applications and kernel since the 1980s would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to make such combination at the time the invention was made.

Regarding claim 6, the combination of IP Infusion and Huang teaches the routing device as recited in claim 1. IP Infusion further teaches an UNIX system incorporating the routing device (page 5, column 1, paragraph 1 discloses that the virtual router system is implemented on Linux, which is a UNIX operating system).

Regarding claim 7, IP Infusion teaches a routing device comprising:
an operating system kernel (page 5, column 1, paragraph 1 discloses that the virtual router is implemented on Linux, VxWorks and OSE, all of which contain an operating system kernel);

a virtual router (Fig. 3 discloses the virtual router 1 in a virtual router system),
a router manager configured to manage the virtual router (Fig. 4 discloses a Global Management Authority (GMA) that creates and manages virtual routers);

an application residing external to the virtual router (The Global Management Authority (GMA) disclosed in Fig. 4 is a software package that performs not only router manager

functions, but also other system administrative functions such as remote login, therefore it is interpreted to anticipate said application recited in the claim); and

a plurality of physical interfaces (Fig. 5 and page 3, column 1, paragraph 1 disclose that the routing device includes multiple physical interfaces);

wherein the application is able to selectively interact with the virtual router and the operating system kernel on a dynamic basis in order to have the virtual router and the operating system kernel perform a plurality of tasks for the application (Page 3, column 1 discloses that GMA is created so that global administrators can login to the router system in runtime and then selectively login to a chosen VR to execute commands).

IP Infusion does not teach that the virtual router resides external to the operating system kernel.

However, Huang discloses a virtualized networking system that comprises an operating system kernel and a plurality of virtualized networking kernels (VNK) and processes residing external to the OS kernel (see page 3, column 2). A VNK is the result of extracting the networking portion of the FreeBSD protocol from the kernel and moving it into the user space, i.e. a VNK is an instance of the user-space IP stack (see page 5, column 1, paragraph 2). Huang further discloses that one or more virtualized processes can run on top of a VNK to implement networking protocols such routing protocols above the IP layer, as the purpose of ENTRAPID is to provide a protocol development environment (see page 4, column 1, paragraph 1 and page 8, column 1, section VII). Thus, a VNK and its corresponding virtualized processes together form a virtual router.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify IP Infusion's virtual router system with Huang's teaching so that the routing device further comprises an operating system kernel wherein the virtual routers resides external to the operating system kernel. One would have been motivated to combine as such for the desirable advantages that (1) the resulted system allows each copy of the IP stack to work independently; (2) existing user-space applications can be ported immediately to the virtual router (Huang, page 4, column 1), and (3) developers can monitor and modify any aspect of the entire protocol stack without having to make any changes to the kernel (Huang, page 3, column 2, last paragraph).

Furthermore, the IP fusion reference states very specifically in the section "Defining Virtual Routing" on page 2 that "a virtual router is an emulation of a physical router at the software layer" and "Essentially many instances of router an protocol code may be running on a single unit," which disclosure implies that the many instances of router must share the same operating system kernel when running on a single unit. IP Infusion, section "Virtual routing Requirements" on page 2 further discloses that a VR must contain its own instance of the applicable routing protocols and be fully independent from another VR. Such requirements imposed by IP fusion on its VR is met by the ENTRAPID model proposed by Huang. Therefore, one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine them at the time the present invention was made.

Regarding claim 8, the combination of IP Infusion and Huang teaches the routing device of claim 7. IP Infusion further teaches that software is used to implement the virtual router and

the router manager (Page 5, column 2, paragraph 2 discloses that a virtual router comprises a full implementation of a physical router at the software level).

Regarding claim 9, the combination of IP Infusion and Huang teaches the routing device of claim 7. IP Infusion further teaches that the virtual router includes:

a routing protocol stack configured to handle a plurality of routing protocols (Fig. 3 discloses a virtual router supporting a plurality of routing protocols including RIP, OSPF and BGP);

a plurality of interface drivers configured to communicate with corresponding physical interfaces (Page 6, column 2, paragraph 2 discloses that multiple interfaces can be assigned to a single VR, where it is well known in the art that every physical interface inherently corresponds to an interface driver);

an Internet Protocol (IP) stack configured to interact with the routing protocol stack and perform a forwarding function via the plurality of interface drivers (Fig. 3 discloses that the virtual router contains a TCP/IP stack that interacts with routing protocols such as RIP, OSPF and BGP on one side, and connects to a forwarding plane to perform forwarding function via the physical interfaces on the other side, as is described in page 4, column 1, paragraph 2; The forwarding plane inherently forwards packets to the physical interfaces via interface drivers.), the IP stack having a forwarding information table, information from which is used to perform the forwarding function (page 6, column 1, paragraph 3 discloses that the TCP/IP stack includes many features of a VR, such as software forwarding and management of the FIBs); and

IP Infusion does not teach but Huang teaches a socket layer having a corresponding socket application programming interface, the socket layer configured to facilitate interactions

between the IP stack and the routing protocol stack and the application, wherein the socket application programming interface is used to facilitate communications with the socket layer (Huang, page 4, column 1, paragraph 1 discloses that applications built using the BSD socket API can be ported immediately to a virtualized network kernel (VNK) which is a user-space IP protocol stack. Huang's disclosure implies that VNK supports a BSD socket API.)

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Huang's teaching of socket API to IP Infusion's virtual router system such that a socket layer is included to facilitate interactions between the IP stack, the routing protocol stack and the application, as is recited in the claim. One would have been motivated to combine as such for the reason that sockets have been widely used in network programming as an inter-process communication mechanism since its introduction in the 1980s.

Regarding claim 10, the combination of IP Infusion and Huang teaches the routing device of claim 9.

IP Infusion does not teach that the IP stack of the virtual router resides external to the operating system kernel.

However, as mentioned above in claim 7, Huang discloses a virtualized networking system that comprises an operating system kernel and a plurality of virtual routers residing external to the OS kernel (see page 3, column 2). Each virtual router comprises one VNK and a plurality of corresponding virtualized processes, where the VNK is a user-space IP stack.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify IP Infusion's virtual router system with Huang's teaching such that the IP stack of the virtual router resides external to the operating system kernel. One would have been motivated to combine as such for

the desirable advantages that (1) the resulted system allows each copy of the IP stack to work independently; 2) existing user-space applications can be ported immediately to the virtual router (Huang, page 4, column 1), and (3) developers can monitor and modify any aspect of the entire protocol stack without having to make any changes to the kernel (Huang, page 3, column 2, last paragraph).

Regarding claim 11, the combination of IP Infusion and Huang teaches the routing device of claim 7.

IP Infusion does not teach but Huang further teaches that the operating system kernel includes an associated socket layer, the socket layer having a corresponding socket application programming interface, and the application is able to communicate with the operating system kernel via the associated socket layer using the corresponding socket application programming interface to have the operating system kernel perform one or more of the plurality of tasks (Huang, page 5, column 2, paragraph 1 discloses that ENTRAPID's virtualization approach has been tested on FreeBSD and can be further applied to Windows NT and Solaris. It is known in the art of networking that in FreeBSD, Solaris and Windows, the TCP/IP stack is implemented in the kernel, and is accessible to user space applications via a socket API, i.e., applications external to the operating system kernel communicate with the kernel via a socket layer and a socket API).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify IP Infusion's virtual router system with Huang's teaching so that the operating system kernel of the virtual router system includes an associated socket layer. The fact that socket API has been used as a standard way of communication between networking applications and kernel since the 1980s

would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to make such combination at the time the invention was made.

Regarding claim 12, the combination of IP Infusion and Huang teaches the routing device as recited in claim 7. IP Infusion further teaches an UNIX system incorporating the routing device (page 5, column 1, paragraph 1 discloses that the virtual router system is implemented on Linux, which is a UNIX operating system).

Regarding claim 13, IP Infusion teaches a routing device comprising a plurality of virtual routers (Fig. 4 discloses a plurality of virtual routers VR1, VR 2 and VRn that are situated inside the virtual router system), and

an application residing external to the plurality of virtual routers (The Global Management Authority (GMA) disclosed in Fig. 4 is also an application situated external to the plurality of virtual routers; As the instant invention does not disclose the functions of said application, IP Infusion's GMA is interpreted to anticipate said application recited in the claim);

wherein the application is able to selectively interact with one of the plurality of virtual routers (Page 3, column 1 discloses that GMA is created so that global administrators can login to the router system in runtime and then selectively login to a chosen VR to execute commands).

wherein the application is able to selectively communicate with one or more of the plurality of virtual routers on a dynamic basis to have the one or more virtual routers perform a plurality of tasks (Page 3, column 1 discloses that GMA is created so that global administrators can login to the router system in runtime and then selectively login to a chosen VR to execute commands).

IP Infusion does not disclose that each virtual router has an associated socket layer and an Internet Protocol (IP) stack, wherein the associated socket layer has a corresponding socket application programming interface configured to facilitate communications with the associated socket layer, and the associated socket layer is configured to facilitate interactions between the IP stack and the application

However, Huang discloses in page 4, column 1, paragraph 1 that applications built using the BSD socket API can be ported immediately to a virtualized network kernel (VNK) which is a user-space IP stack. Huang's disclosure implies that the VNK supports a BSD socket API, through which user space applications can communicate with the socket layer and the IP stack.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Huang's teaching of socket API to IP Infusion's virtual router system such that a socket layer and API is included to facilitate interactions between the IP stack and the application, as is recited in the claim. One would have been motivated to combine as such because sockets have been widely used in network programming as an inter-process communication mechanism since its introduction in the 1980s.

Furthermore, the IP fusion reference states very specifically in the section "Defining Virtual Routing" on page 2 that "a virtual router is an emulation of a physical router at the software layer" and "Essentially many instances of router an protocol code may be running on a single unit," which disclosure implies that the many instances of router must share the same operating system kernel when running on a single unit. IP Infusion, section "Virtual routing Requirements" on page 2 further discloses that a VR must contain its own instance of the applicable routing protocols and be fully independent from another VR. Such requirements

imposed by IP fusion on its VR is met by the ENTRAPID model proposed by Huang. Therefore, one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine them at the time the present invention was made.

Regarding claim 15, the combination of IP Infusion and Huang teaches the routing device of claim 13.

IP Infusion does not teach that the plurality of virtual routers reside external to the operating system kernel.

However, Huang discloses in page 3, column 2 a virtualized networking system that comprises an operating system kernel, and a plurality of virtualized networking kernels (VNK) and virtualized processes that reside external to the OS kernel. As is further disclosed in page 5, column 1, paragraph 2, a VNK is the result of extracting the networking portion of the FreeBSD protocol from the kernel and moving it into the user space, therefore, a VNK is an instance of the user-space IP stack.

Huang further discloses that one or more virtualized processes can run on top of a VNK to implement networking protocols such routing protocols above the IP layer (see page 4, column 1, paragraph 1 and page 8, column 1, section VII). Thus, a VNK and its corresponding virtualized processes together form a virtual router.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify IP Infusion's virtual router system with Huang's teaching such that the IP stack of the virtual router resides external to the operating system kernel. One would have been motivated to combine as such for the desirable advantages that (1) the resulted system allows each copy of the IP stack to work

independently; (2) existing user-space applications can be ported immediately to the virtual router (Huang, page 4, column 1), and (3) developers can monitor and modify any aspect of the entire protocol stack without having to make any changes to the kernel (Huang, page 3, column 2, last paragraph).

Regarding claim 16, the combination of IP Infusion and Huang teaches the routing device as recited in claim 13. IP Infusion further teaches an UNIX system incorporating the routing device (page 5, column 1, paragraph 1 discloses that the virtual router system is implemented on Linux, which is a UNIX operating system).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHIRLEY X. ZHANG whose telephone number is (571)270-5012. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am - 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. X. Z./
Examiner, Art Unit 2144
04/10/2008

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2144